

REMARKS

The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for thoroughly reviewing and considering the pending application. The Office Action dated June 10, 2005 has been received and carefully reviewed. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 10 have been amended. Claims 1-13 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 3-6 and 8-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicants' Related Art (hereinafter "the ARA") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,637,007 to *Suzuki et al.* (hereinafter "*Suzuki*"). The rejection of claims 1, 3-6 and 8-12 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is hereby requested.

None of the cited references disclose all the elements recited in claims 1, 3-6, and 8-12. As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to "establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." The Applicants respectfully submit that neither the ARA, nor *Suzuki*, either singularly or in combination, disclose or suggest all the elements recited in claims 1, 3-6, and 8-12, as required under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). More specifically, claims 1, 5, and 10 have been amended to recite a lamp apparatus for a liquid crystal display comprising, among other features, a resin which is "filled in a cavity formed in the holder having the soldering and the wire." Neither the ARA nor *Suzuki*, either singularly or in combination, disclose or suggest this feature. Accordingly, claims 1, 5, and 10 are patentable over the cited references and the Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn. Similarly, claims 6, 11, and 12 which depend from claims 5 and 10 respectively, are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 3 and 8 have been amended to recite a liquid crystal display module comprising, among other features, a resin “filled in a cavity formed in the holder having the soldering and the wire.” As noted above, neither of the cited references, either singularly or in combination, disclose or suggest this feature. As such, claims 3 and 8 are patentable over the cited references and the Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 4 and 9, which depend from claims 3 and 8 respectively, are also patentable for at least the same reasons.

The Office Action also rejected claims 2, 7 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the ARA in view of *Suzuki* as applied to claims 1, 5 and 10 above, and further in view of JP 04046314 A to *Saito* (hereinafter “*Saito*”). As discussed above, claims 1, 5, and 10, from which claims 2, 7, and 13 depend, respectively, are patentably distinct over the ARA in view of *Suzuki*. The Applicants submit that *Saito* does not address the shortcomings of both the ARA and *Suzuki*. More specifically, *Saito* does not disclose a resin “filled in a cavity formed in the holder having the soldering and the wire,” as recited in claims 1, 5, and 10. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established and claims 2, 7 and 13 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the ARA in view of *Suzuki* as applied to claims 1, 5 and 10 above and further in view of *Saito* and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The application is in a condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner believes a conversation with the Applicant’s representative would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

Application No.: 09/891,284
Amtd. dated October 11, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action dated June 10, 2005

Docket No.: 8733.438.00

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: October 11, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Rebecca G. Rudich

Registration No.: 41,786
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant